

REMARKS

The Official Action dated June 30, 2005, has been carefully considered. Consideration of the changes and remarks presented herein and reconsideration of the rejections are therefore respectfully requested. Claims 2 and 16-19 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-15 have been amended, while claims 20-23 have been added. It is believed that these changes do not involve any introduction of new matter, and thereby entry is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 3-15 and 20-23 remain in the application for consideration.

In the Official Action, claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Vosbikian (U.S. Patent No. 3,469,710). The Examiner asserted that Vosbikian discloses a body, apertures, protrusions, walls, a bottom wall and slots. Moreover, the Examiner contends that the limitations concerning the body being configured to support a shelf, having slots for supporting a shelf, and being configured to engage a standard are merely functional recitations of which the bracket of Vosbikian is capable of achieving.

However, as will be set forth in detail below, it is submitted that the support brackets and support assemblies as defined by claims 1 and 3-15 are not anticipated by the teachings of Vosbikian. Accordingly, this rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As defined by claim 1, from which claims 3-7 depend, the present invention is directed toward a support bracket for a hanger bar, the support bracket having a body, the body having a bottom wall, opposing side walls, an aperture configured to receive a first portion of a support hook and at least two protrusions configured to secure the support hook to the body. The aperture is located in the bottom wall. The support hook simultaneously contacts the protrusions and the bottom wall.

As defined by claim 8, from which claims 9-15 and 20-23 depend, the present invention is directed toward a support assembly for supporting a hanger bar, the support assembly having a support hook and a support bracket. The support hook has an upper portion, a lower portion having a semi-cylinder member configured to support a hanger bar, and a middle portion between the upper and lower portions which extends away from the upper portion at an angle between 120-150 degrees. The support bracket includes a body having an aperture configured to receive the upper portion of the support hook and at least two protrusions configured to secure the support hook to the body.

The Vosbikian reference generally relates to a bracket and hook assembly (column 1, lines 10-11). More particularly, Vosbikian discloses that the hooks have a base portion which extend through a lateral slot in the bracket and are retained by flexible sides in a rear channel so that the hooks can pivot relative to the bracket (column 1, lines 33-36). In addition, Vosbikian teaches that the bracket plate is retained on a wall or ceiling by means of either a strippable coating or fastening means, such as screws (column 1, lines 65-68).

Rejection for anticipation or lack of novelty requires, as the first step in the query, that all elements of the claimed invention be described in single reference. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 493 U.S.P.Q.853 (1989). Applicant is unable to find any teaching or disclosure by Vosbikian of a support bracket or a support assembly as set forth in independent claims 1 and 8, respectively. In regards to independent claim 1, the support bracket recites having a bottom wall and at least two protrusions configured to support a support hook, wherein the support hook simultaneously contacts the protrusions and the bottom wall. Vosbikian fails to teach this limitation. Particularly, Vosbikian teaches that once the hook is placed within the bracket, the hook only contacts the bottom of the bracket and not the beads, thus leaving a

gap between them, as is clearly shown in Figs. 2 and 6. Therefore, Vosbikian does not teach the support brackets as set forth in independent claim 1.

In regards to independent claim 8, the present inventive support assembly recites having a support hook having an upper portion, a lower portion, and a middle portion, the middle portion between the upper and lower portions which extends away from the upper portion at an angle between 120-150 degrees. Vosbikian fails to teach this limitation. Vosbikian fails to teach a support assembly including a support hook and a support bracket, where the support hook has a middle portion between the upper and lower portions which extends away from the upper portion at an angle between 120-150 degrees. Particularly, Vosbikain teaches having hooks with downwardly extending portions bent at substantially right angles to the base (column 2, lines 4-8). As such, Vosbikian does not teach a support hook having a middle portion extending away from the upper portion at an angle between 120-150 degrees. Therefore, Vosbikian does not teach the support assemblies as set forth in independent claim 8.

As such, the support brackets and support assemblies in the present invention are not taught or anticipated by Vosbikian.

It is believed that the above amendments and remarks represent a complete response to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102, and as such, place the present application and claims 1, 3-15 and 20-23 in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and an early allowance are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Clayton L. Kuhnell
Clayton L. Kuhnell
Reg. No. 48,691
Attorney for Applicants
DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP

**1900 Chemed Center
255 E. Fifth Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
(513) 977-8377**

1191491v1